REMARKS

Claims 1-14 remain pending in the application. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections in view of the remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-3, 6, 11, and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang (U.S. Pat. No. 6,012,506) in view of Ciuca et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,330,899). This rejection is respectfully traversed. It is a longstanding rule that to establish a prima facie case of obviousness of a claimed invention, all of the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 180 USPQ 143 (CCPA 1974), see MPEP §2143.03. Furthermore, all of the claim limitations must be arranged as in the claim. Here, the Office Action fails to provide **any** reference that teaches the claimed obstacle detection stopping device.

More particularly, independent claim 1 is directed towards a solar radiation shielding apparatus including an obstacle detection stopping device for stopping an extension of a solar radiation shielding member after an obstacle contacts the solar radiation shielding member. Among other elements, the claimed apparatus includes an obstacle detection stopping device. The obstacle detection stopping device includes an obstacle detector and a stop. The obstacle detector frictionally engages the winding pulley and is adapted to stop rotation of the winding pulley after the tension exerted on said lifting cord is interrupted. The stop operably engages with the driving shaft and is

adapted to stop rotation of the driving shaft in response to rotation of the driving shaft relative to the winding pulley which is stopped by said obstacle detector.

Thus, invention set forth in claim 1 is configured such that the obstacle detector stops the rotation of the winding pulley when the solar radiation shielding member collides with (detects) an obstacle, which results in the stop being applied to block unwinding of the lifting cord. Specifically, when the solar radiation shielding member collides with an obstacle and tension is no longer exerted on the lifting cord, the obstacle detector exerts a frictional force on the winding pulley to block rotation of the winding pulley. Further, if the rotation of the winding pulley is blocked, the winding pulley rotates relative to the driving shaft, and the stop is applied by the relative rotation to stop the rotation of rotating shaft. As a result, the lowering of the solar radiation shielding member is stopped.

In this way, the invention set forth in claim 1 is configured such that the obstacle detector and the stop are employed to stop the lowering of the solar radiation shielding member, and the generation of twine in the lifting cord can be prevented when the solar radiation shielding member collides with an obstacle.

In contrast to the claimed configuration, the solar radiation shielding apparatus disclosed by Wang includes friction adjusters 50, 51 and 52. The friction adjusters 50, 51 and 52 are, however, provided for the purpose of maintaining the slats 21 in a state of equilibrium, and not for stopping the lowering of the slat 21 when the solar radiation shielding member collides with an obstacle. For at least this reason, Wang fails to disclose any member corresponding to the obstacle detection stopping device of claim 1.

Further in contrast to the claimed invention, the solar radiation shielding apparatus disclosed by Ciuca includes an adjustable friction member 80. The adjustable friction member 80 is, however, provided for the purpose of maintaining the slats 18 in a state of equilibrium, and not for stopping the lowering of the slat 18 when the slat 18 collides with an obstacle. For at least this reason, Ciuca fails to disclose any member corresponding to the obstacle detection stopping device of claim 1.

Since neither Wang nor Ciuca disclose the claimed obstacle detection stopping device, the combination thereof cannot yield the claimed invention. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1.

Claims 2, 3, 6, 11 and 12 depend from claim 1 and should be in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons as set forth above.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

The Examiner states that claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicant thanks the Examiner for the careful consideration given claims 4, 5, and 7-10 but elects to defer rewriting these claims in independent form until the Examiner considers the foregoing remarks regarding claim 1. Applicant respectfully requests, however, a continuing indication of the allowability of claims 4, 5, and 7-10.

Applicant acknowledges with thanks the allowance of claims 13 and 14.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 23, 2009

By: /Bryant E. Wade/
Bryant E. Wade
Reg. No. 40,344

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

BEW/pvd

14478013